

Examiner-Initiated Interview Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	10/091,374	BONE, DANIEL
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Theresa T Snider	1744

All Participants:

Status of Application: _____

(1) Theresa T Snider.

(3) ____.

(2) Mark Elchuk.

(4) ____.

Date of Interview: 16 August 2004

Time: _____

Type of Interview:

Telephonic
 Video Conference
 Personal (Copy given to: Applicant Applicant's representative)

Exhibit Shown or Demonstrated: Yes No

If Yes, provide a brief description: _____

Part I.

Rejection(s) discussed:

Claims discussed:

1, 5-13, 16-17, 20, 22, 24-25, 27-28 and 32-44

Prior art documents discussed:

See Continuation Sheet

Part II.

SUBSTANCE OF INTERVIEW DESCRIBING THE GENERAL NATURE OF WHAT WAS DISCUSSED:

Part III.

It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview directly resulted in the allowance of the application. The examiner will provide a written summary of the substance of the interview in the Notice of Allowability.
 It is not necessary for applicant to provide a separate record of the substance of the interview, since the interview did not result in resolution of all issues. A brief summary by the examiner appears in Part II above.

(Examiner/SPE Signature)

(Applicant/Applicant's Representative Signature – if appropriate)

Continuation of Identification of prior art discussed: Examiner informed Mr. Elchuk that claims 1, 5-13, 16-17, 20, 22, 24-25, 27-38 and 40-44 were allowable for reasons set forth in the Office Action of 3/30/2004. Examiner expresesef how the insertion of 'linearly' into claim 39 does not put it in condition for allowance because the release member of Lang, #124, moves along a line, though it me a curved line. Mr. Elchuk suggested inserting the allowable subject matter of claim 40 into claim 39. Examiner agreed that would make claim 39 free of the prior art. Examiner noted that claim 39 is directed to a method of making a vacuum cleaner however the claim fails to set forth a nozzle structure and that pages 2-3 of the Office Action of 3/30/2004 did not appear to be addressed in the amendment of 6/25/2004. Mr. Elchuk agreed to submit a supplemental amendment to insert the allowable subject matter into claim 39, to address pages 2-3 of the Office Action and to correct any other informalities. .